## **EXHIBIT 14**

		1
1		
2	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT	
3	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
4	Case No. 05-44481	
5	x	
6	In the Matter of:	
7		
8	DELPHI CORPORATION, ET AL.,	
9		
10	Debtor.	
11		
12	x	
13		
14	U.S. Bankruptcy Court	
15	One Bowling Green	
16	New York, New York	
17		
18	December 6, 2007	
19	10:28 a.m.	
20		
21	BEFORE:	
22	HON. ROBERT D. DRAIN	
23	U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE	
24		
25		

objection and I don't have any questions for the witness.

THE COURT: Is there any objection to that?

MR. FOX: No objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I had a question. Mr. Tepper, you answered a couple of questions earlier about the condition in the December 3rd EPCA that interest expense be a certain dollar amount, are you aware of the creditors committee limited objection on that point?

THE WITNESS: I've heard something about it; I don't know the exact objection.

THE COURT: They -- they believe it should be another, roughly, eighty million, am I right on that?

MR. ISENMAN: Forty-five.

THE COURT: Forty-five million, excuse me.

MR. ISENMAN: Forty, sorry.

THE COURT: Forty. Were the interest expense at that level, what would be the downside effect on the equity, the reorganization equity that --

THE WITNESS: Well we, initially set the interest expense -- it was because of what the initial bank feedback was, that it should be under 600 million, is what I believe that feedback was from the banks in this deal. And we had originally talked about 560 before and then we raised it to 575. And this last deal we went back and pushed people to get to 585 so this -- as far as history of it is concerned. I

212-267-6868 516-608-2400

guess our view is that it becomes -- the interest burden becomes to high given the incredible uncertainty we have in the next year or two, number one. And because of that high uncertainty, it has an oversize effect on the equity, because you can jeopardize -- you know, if I think about one thing at night it's whether -- whether there's too much debt here and too much interest to begin with. And it concerns me.

equity now too; they're not getting any cash. I would understand their argument -- I'd be a lot less sympathetic to their argument if they were getting cash because they would be loading the debt on the company but they're getting the equity. And that raises the concern in my mind that there's -- there's, perhaps, more option value in that condition then there is downside that the plan investors are protecting against.

THE WITNESS: Well, if you -- if you -- you know, look I -- I guess if you want to say that, you know, every ten million of additional interest expense is so moldable on the value of the business, decrease of the value of the business, you could go that way strictly. But the question is, in this environment of uncertain economic conditions it just becomes a little bit more, in my view. So, you know, whether it's, you know, 400 million, 500 million, 600 million, 700 million, eight hundred million, in that ballpark of difference, that would be the difference, you know, to the value of the company.

212-267-6868

was a little window in the -- things got a little better in the middle of the fall and now it's gotten worse again.

The fact of the matter is that when you look at it, what maybe optional, maybe there was an opportunity for a self-funded plan here. There's no any testimony here, none put in by the objectors, that suggests there's any possibility of doing a self-funded plan here. And not a single self-funded plan proposal has been presented to the debtors. In fact, the testimony was no other proposal has been presented.

And oh, by the way, the Highland led group which is represented in court today and who filed an objection which is now being prosecuted for today, that group -- they're not hindered by the lockups. They told -- the testimony was that they told -- Mr. Miller testified they were going to present him with a proposal, they didn't. Maybe they will. But not as we sit here today.

THE COURT: Well, now, you said earlier and I believe one of your witnesses said that the debtors were precluded from terminating the agreement. That's not entirely true. You can terminate there's just a cost to doing it.

MR. BUTLER: Well, we could breach the agreement,

Your Honor. I mean the fact of the matter is -- and that's why

the (indiscernible, coughing) from our perspective and we'll

talk about corporate governance in just a few minutes, the

bookends that the board of directors had in mind, what

212-267-6868 516-608-2400

Mr. Miller has testified to, I believe, in his declaration directly, the bookends we talked about was, you know -- you -- if there's a termination event here, if this thing blows up, and, you know, and we go to war with Appaloosa, somebody is going to probably pay a hundred million dollars. Either we're going to be able to convince you, who is probably going to have to make that decision, that they -- that they intentionally breached, in which case their damages are limited at a hundred million dollars. Or they will be able to convince you that we breached and it's not an alternative transaction capped at eighty some odd million it's a breach under the agreements and it's actionable at a hundred million.

So the bookends are, if we get into a war with these plan investors that somebody is going to pay, probably, a hundred million dollars. We'll figure out over the next couple of years who that is, and in the meantime we will not have any plan investors to negotiate with and the syndicate -- the syndicate established in Exhibits 131 and 132 are released. And they're released in what the company has testified to, Mr. Sheehan testified and Mr. Miller testified to and Mr. Resnick testified, particularly as the company's investment banker, are the most turbulent markets in memory. And Mr. Tepper testified about the volatility of the market and the impact on price. That -- those are the factors people consider -- the debtors considered in thinking about the business

212-267-6868 516-608-2400